DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 397 946 PS 024 264

AUTHOR Hausfather, Sam
TITLE Power Relations Underlying the Changing of Conceptions of Knowledge in an Elementary Classroom.
PUB DATE 10 Apr 96
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, April 8-12, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Design; *Elementary Education; Intellectual Development; Learning Experience; Student Empowerment; Student Role; *Teacher Student Relationship; Teaching Methods; *Thematic Approach; Thinking Skills

ABSTRACT

Current reform efforts in education emphasize role changes for students and teachers within classrooms and schools. A phenomenological study examined one teacher's internal conflict while negotiating the shifting boundaries of power relations between teacher and students. The goal of this study was to explore the processes and constraints involved in the creation and evolution of a theme-study curriculum. This exploration attempted to elucidate meanings behind theme study, in terms of the processes and constraints involved in implementing theme study in one classroom, the meanings of theme study developed by teacher and students, and the resulting conceptions of knowledge revealed by student actions and teacher reflections. The students were fifth-graders from a laboratory school in the southeastern United States. The results suggested that there were three perspectives on knowledge that became apparent in the roles students took: stable/passive, inquisitory/active, and communal. The power structure in the classroom appeared to be marked by relatively sharp boundaries between teacher and students. Results suggested that inquisitory and active approaches to knowledge were possible only within the shifting boundaries of power relations between teacher and students. Empowering student voice and limiting teacher control appeared to underlie movement in students' conceptions of knowledge. Contains 39 references. (MOK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 397 946

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Power relations underlying the changing of conceptions of knowledge in an elementary classroom

Sam Hausfather

Berry College

Mount Berry, GA 30149-5019

shausfather@berry.edu

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sam Hausfather
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association
New York, April 10, 1996

PS 024264

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Current reform efforts in education emphasize role changes for students and teachers within classrooms and schools (Corbett & Wilson, 1995). Schools for a democratic society demand students who have a voice in their classrooms, in their education, and in society. Empowerment has become a buzzword in the reform movement in terms of both students and teachers. Yet little is written about the underlying power conflicts which result from the empowering of students within classrooms. As we move from behaviorist to constructivist approaches to learning, we must face head-on the implications of different approaches to knowledge. This study reports, from a first-person perspective, on the internal conflict of a teacher negotiating the shifting boundaries of power relations between teacher and students.

My goal was to investigate the processes and constraints involved in the creation and evolution of a theme study curriculum. This study attempted to elucidate meanings behind theme study, in terms of the processes and constraints involved in implementing theme study in one classroom, the meanings of theme study developed by teacher and students, and the resulting conceptions of knowledge revealed by student actions and teacher reflections. Integrating instruction through themes brings together the long tradition of project-based curricula with an interdisciplinary approach to knowledge. An interdisciplinary approach emphasizes the connectedness of knowledge, applying methods and language from more than one discipline to examine a central theme (Jacobs, 1989). A project-based curricula allows students involvement in solving broad problems of interest in several fields (Dewey, 1931).

Renewed interest in the thematic organization of curriculum has surfaced as part of developments in cognitive science and the whole language movement. The cognitive apprenticeship model emphasizes learning in terms of the context of knowledge use in solving problems and carrying out tasks (Collins, Brown, & Newman, 1989). Ann Brown's work (Brown & Campione, 1990) has tied the development of an intentional learning environment to a theme-based curriculum where students develop a culture of learning in the classroom. Teaching practices in a community of learning were marked by: curricula organized around themes; cooperative learning; expertise distributed among students and teacher; and students as apprentice learners, gaining research skills (Brown & Campione, 1990). The whole language

movement builds on this cognitive science base (Willinsky, 1990), emphasizing units of study as focal points for inquiry, involving students in planning, and giving them choices of authentic activities (Goodman, 1986).

This report will give a chronological re-telling of events in a classroom experimenting with a theme-study approach. Events in knowledge construction are highlighted in examining conceptions of knowledge of students and teacher. The study examines changing conceptions of knowledge, defining three approaches to knowledge students could take within classrooms. Possible underlying causes are explored for changes in students' approaches to knowledge. An analysis of power relations reveals changes in the social construction of the classroom. Finally, a connection is postulated between changing power relations within the classroom and changes in approaches to knowledge.

Methodology

This study reports the conclusions from a year-long study of my own classroom as a teacher-researcher. I re-entered the classroom after several years in graduate study, securing a fifth-grade teaching position at a small college laboratory school in the southeastern United States. The laboratory school had approximately 110 children in kindergarten through fifth grade, comprising a variety of backgrounds with both college-related and working-class families well represented. Studying my own practice, I intended to organize curricula around the problems, needs, and interests of the students through interdisciplinary investigations of themes. I aspired to make visible the teacher's role in the generation of knowledge about teaching and learning (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993).

Phenomenological action research was employed to analyze my practice. My interest was distinctly qualitative and phenomenological: not to reduce what I was doing to a set of data, but to reveal the essential meanings of theme study as it was experienced in my classroom. Phenomenology is the science of phenomena, of objects and events as they appear in our experience. Phenomenology "endeavors to describe how the world is constituted and experienced through conscious acts" (van Manen, 1990, p. 184). The question continually asked in phenomenology is: What is the nature or meaning of human experience? (Polakow, 1985). Phenomenology attempts to reveal and describe the internal meaning structures of lived

experience, the essences of phenomena.

Max van Manen (1990) outlines a phenomenological approach to qualitative research methodology in education. His model is based on "textual reflection on the lived experiences and practical actions of everyday life with the intent to increase one's thoughtfulness and practical resourcefulness or tact" (p. 4). Essential to phenomenological research is the textual practice of reflective writing. In explicating lived phenomena, we reflect on experiences already past. The research process is inseparable from the writing process, as writing forces us into a reflective attitude. Writing externalizes the internal, distancing us from the immediate life experience and creating a reflective cognitive stance. Writing involves a dialectic process of separating us from what we know while uniting us more closely with what we know; distancing us from experience while drawing us more closely into that experience; abstracting our experience of the world while concretizing our understanding of the world. "The methodology of phenomenology requires a dialectical going back and forth among these various levels of questioning" (van Manen, 1990, p. 131). Carefully cultivated thoughtfulness is emphasized over any specific technique.

Personal experience is the starting point for gathering data. "To be aware of the structure of one's own experience of a phenomenon may provide the researcher with clues for orienting oneself to the phenomenon and thus to all the other stages of phenomenological research" (van Manen, 1990, p. 57). One must always be aware of one's role in the life experience one is studying. Instead of the participant-observer role often mentioned in ethnographic research, one adopts the role of observant participant, maintaining an orientation of reflectivity while immersing oneself in practice. Close observation then allows one to enter the lifeworld of the experience studied. "Close observation involves an attitude of assuming a relation that is as close as possible while retaining a hermeneutic alertness to situations that allows us to constantly step back and reflect on the meaning of those situations" (van Manen, 1990, p. 69). Close observation provides the anecdotes that begin the development of a cogent sense of the lived experience.

I determined to incorporate this phenomenological orientation into my action research. I made use of the core components of action research, such as a focus on the practical,

systematic inquiry, and reflexivity (McCutcheon & Jung, 1990), and I employed these components within the structure of the action research spiral delineated by Kemmis and McTaggart (1982). Kemmis and McTaggart have refined a model that structures critical reflection into a cyclical action research spiral. The process involves four dynamic, complementary steps. First, one develops a strategic plan, taking account of risks, constraints, and unpredictability. Deliberate action follows next, with the researcher keeping goals in mind and flexibly looking back at the plans. Careful observation is then undertaken to document the effects of actions and the action process. Finally, retrospective reflection seeks to make sense of the processes, problems, issues, and constraints. The process is both descriptive, building a better picture, and evaluative, pointing toward revisions to the plan. The cycle then repeats, more refined but also with questions reinvented. Reflexivity, a distinctive aspect of ethnography (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983), is thus built into a model of action research. Throughout the year I made use of textual reflection on the lived experiences in the classroom, as well as compiling video and audio recordings, classroom artifacts, and planning documents. As I began the in-depth rereading, rewriting, and analysis of the data I collected, I attempted to view my data through this phenomenological lens, drawing themes out of the data and connecting them to conceptual structures that might illuminate them.

My interest in pursuing this qualitative research is distinctly in its instrumental utility. Instrumental utility involves the usefulness of comprehension in helping us understand a complex situation; the usefulness of anticipation in helping us map a particular terrain so we may better understand where we can go; and the usefulness of a guide in calling attention to aspects of a situation we might otherwise miss (Eisner, 1991). I aim to disclose deeper meanings in classroom life, meanings unique to my local situation yet rife with questions applicable to any classroom. Although I will suggest conclusions, readers must create their own questions from this study and make them useful to their own practice.

The construction of a curriculum

My aim was to create a theme study classroom, organizing interdisciplinary investigations of themes around the problems, needs, and interests of the students. Student involvement in research was a key aspect of my conception of a theme study classroom.

Through research, students could become active stakeholders in the teaching/learning process. I was not content with my students being confined to the role of learners and myself being restricted to the role of teacher. Therefore I pushed the students to learn for the purpose of sharing their knowledge, with each research opportunity designed to become an opportunity for students to teach each other. Each also became a chance for me to experiment with different arrangements of the learning and teaching process (see Table 1). I moved between group and individual responsibilities, attempting to create an environment for student inquiry. Different structures were used for organizing our knowledge, creating environments that aimed to promote the social construction of knowledge. Creating a constructivist classroom was revealed as a process, as curriculum responded indirectly in unforeseen ways.

Table 1. Evolution of student research opportunities.

Theme/Content	Learning Arrangement	Teaching Context
Why are we here?/ geology/geography	Cross-grade research & learning groups, create teaching texts	Individuals teach small group with text
Understanding differences/ Native Americans	Individuals research, complete chart, create artifact	Groups teach class, class fills charts
Exploring the unknown/ Astronomy	Individuals research, create poster & brochure	Individuals teach class, class creates books
Exploring the unknown/ Early U.S. explorers	Individuals research, groups collaborate, prepare notes	Individuals interviewed by class while fill charts
Investigations/ U.S. states	Individuals research, write report & poster, group edits	Individuals teach class, class takes notes
Greed & charity/ Slavery/civil war	Group or individual research, prepare notes	Group or individuals teach class, class takes notes

Under the theme *Why are we here?*, my first cycle of action research involved establishing geology research groups, beginning the process of seeing students as researchers and teachers. The results, however, did not necessarily point to joint construction of

knowledge, as books and student lectures appeared to become the sources of school knowledge instead of the teacher, still separate from student knowledge and experience.

> Knowledge was seen as a thing to discover, an answer that was out there and only needed to be copied in your own notes. Yet it appeared to become the children's knowledge, their property as they defined their topic and the questions they saw as important. Deciding those questions was not easy. The tendency was toward simple, broad questions as opposed to deeper specific questions. (Teacher Journal, 12/27/91)

Our second cycle, involving study of Native Americans and how we understood differences, involved students somewhat more actively in processing knowledge, as writing, literature, and art all came together around the theme. Students were beginning to take active roles in the joint construction of knowledge, but I sensed they were not participating enough in instructional conversations within the classroom.

> I also feel the pressure of the kids for me to teach in predetermined ways. They resist using manipulatives or exploring in depth the reasons why an algorithm exists. Give us the trick, or let us do it the way we've been taught before. Just give us the knowledge and let us get on with our work! The idea of constructing knowledge together runs smack into the pressure, both from kids and from the teacher, to move on quickly and get through with the topic. (Teacher Journal, 12/27/91).

Student perceptions of what a teacher is or does, of how learning happens, influenced how I taught and what I felt I was able to do in the classroom. The enacted curriculum became a negotiation between myself, the children, and institutional pressures.

My next cycle of action research involved the students more in designing the research around our *Exploring the Unknown* theme, although my relationship to knowledge limited my implementation of student alternatives. I attempted to negotiate with the class their approach to research on explorers.

> Students (s) are seated at tables in groups of four. The teacher is at the front of the room, before the blackboard, talking to the whole class.
> Teacher: I looked over what you webbed for the ideas and what you knew about explorers. What I need to figure out now is, I'd like you to help me. . . I want to find out from you what different ideas you have for finding out about the who, what and why for the different groups, and how we should present that for each other. (Quiet meets me as I look out at the group). Any ideas for how we should do it this time? (pause) No ideas?
> s: You're a teacher, you're supposed to know.

s: Yeah, we don't know.
Teacher: Yes, I have a little more experience than you do, but you have 6 years of experience.
s: You have a lot more! You have 42.
Teacher: ...So it sounds like you don't have any great ideas about this, do you?
s: I do! Read books!
s: Go to the library
s: Read an encyclopedia
s: Watch a movie
s: Play games (Videotape transcription, 1/14/92).

I was pushing the students to establish a clear sense of the research process before they had enough knowledge of the content involved. I needed to view knowledge as mutable, allowing students the freedom within limits to respond to the knowledge they create. At the same time, the students wanted a clear sense of expectations from me, an idea of the direction they were to pursue. I found it difficult to balance their needs with a flexible approach to the knowledge we were exploring. My relationship to knowledge of explorers was already set, and the boundaries I had created for this knowledge colored my ability to open alternative avenues of exploration.

It was through other activities that I began to form more of an understanding of alternative modes of knowing. Using a simulation exercise, students assumed the roles of seven explorers, each claiming to be the true discoverer of America, presenting their case through questioning by another student. Afterwards, I attempted to have knowledge seen as something worth debating, not staid facts and set answers. Sitting around our tables, many participated in generating ideas and weighing our thinking. Using an excerpt from the writings of historian Samuel Eliot Morison (Beck, 1977), students were forced to judge the nature of knowledge. The excitement the students experienced in this discussion led me to a better understanding of the importance of exploring "big" problems with the students. "Big" problems had enough meat on them to afford us a look in detail, the existence of alternative interpretations, and no clearly established right answer.

I was struck by this different relationship to knowledge. Already, my astronomy activities were becoming a time-consuming, in-depth process marked by my attempts to

negotiate knowledge with the students. A discussion in class on reasons for the seasons turned into a hard look at naive theories and a forceful push to logically justify each theory. I was encouraging questioning and multiple connections as students began presenting their individual planet research. Questioning knowledge, inquiring into the meanings behind the facts, was fast becoming the enterprise that I saw as primary in my classroom.

> This is exactly the type of relationship to knowledge which I am interested in promoting. I must see "thematic" pale in comparison to "inquiry" as the focus for the relationship to knowledge. Themes might promote curriculum which pushes us to inquire, but by no means will that necessarily happen. Projects push kids more in that direction. I've seen that this week as kids report to the class on their planet posters. As kids take on the role of producer of knowledge, knowledge which they have researched and selected, they identify themselves with that knowledge. And the other kids respond with valuable questions, interest in knowing more, as Ted did in asking Kirsten about relative sizes of Mars' moons. (Teacher Journal, 1/18/92).

In designing our planet research, I was concerned with creating this sense of a culture of learning. Individual planet reports gave each child a chance to become an expert on their particular planet, with a clear goal of presenting their new-found knowledge to the class. They were to prepare a presentation to the class on their planet, creating a poster and brochure to aid them in their presentation. Planet posters and brochures made that knowledge public while allowing the student creativity in expression. Teaching the class put the student in a different role, both sharing and defending their efforts.

> ...when Nate told us of the high temperatures on Venus, I questioned why they were so high. Nate mentioned the many clouds. We looked again at what those clouds were, mostly carbon dioxide. What is carbon dioxide? Various kids mentioned breathing, trees, and plants. Someone mentioned the ozone and heating of earth. So I pushed further into the greenhouse effect and global warming. Many had heard about these and were concerned. How was it related to Venus and carbon dioxide clouds? So we discussed pollution, deforestation, and warming, and connected it to Venus. Someone brought up the possibility of trees on Venus, and we discussed trees changing Venus' atmosphere to more oxygen . . . (Teacher Journal, 1/26/92).

I took an active role in nudging the class toward clarifying and questioning the knowledge presented. I wanted discussions to flow from the presentations; discussions that promoted an inquiring approach toward knowledge while supporting the development of those in the class.

I experimented with somewhat different arrangements in our *Taking off on Investigations* theme, struck by how the subject areas determined the direction of the curriculum. Simulations and literature were both essential activities in integrating and creating the theme. A wagon train simulation allowed the children to participate in real problem-solving discussion time, where occurred genuine attempts to convince each other based on one's own thinking.

> A group of 7 kids sit tightly around a round table, very involved in a discussion of what to do about guards selling water along the wagon train route.
> Bill: I think the same thing as Ann's saying. Number 1, there won't be enough water. Number 2, then we'll become weak and we wont go that far. Number 3, chances of you finding water are not that good. The guards are powerful, and if we sell something to get money and get something that we do need, that's good.
> Jim: What if they don't want to trade?
> Ann: No, we sell things to other people, like a shop, and take the money and go to the guards and get the money.
> Joe: Where do you get something to sell?
> Ann: Well all 3 of us have.
> Bill: Like if you have something you don't need.
> Bill: OK, what was your idea?
> Doreen: I said the same idea. Except I think you might want to have to pay for the water and agree to share it, because you might not get anyone to buy their stuff. That might be a good thing to have in case you can't sell the stuff. I don't think there's going to be very many shops along the prairie...
> Ann: OK, everyone gets a few minutes to think about it. GO. (puts head down on hand in thinking pose)
> Sam: Wait, instead of thinking about it, I think its better if people can
> Doreen: Talk about it.
> Sam: Yes, can convince other people, say things to convince other people.
> Ann: Yes, go ahead.
> Doreen: If you're going to have to sell things that are unnecessary, that's good to get room for water, but you might not be able to sell it or you might not be able to get enough money for it. But if we put our money together, we'll be able to get some water but we'll have to share the water.
> David: I don't care, I have 5 barrels.
> Bill: Yeah, but... I'll try to convince you of mine. Your idea is good, but we probably won't get enough water. See, we need enough water to get us to the next settlement which is far. But if we don't get enough water, then... (Videotape transcription, 2/20/92).

The students were intensely involved in the process and the problems encountered. There was

lively debate as they explored the positives and negatives of problems. They were quite determined to come to decisions that they see as valid and agreeable to all. We were getting closer here to the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). Joint problem solving actively involved the students in a social transaction, allowing students to do collaboratively what they were not yet ready to do alone. In our group work existed the type of collaboration that involved students in hard thinking, not for me but for themselves.

"Powerful" ideas around the issue of stereotyping began to emerge which united all our studies. A larger theme emerged as our studies progressed, unifying all our studies as involved in exploring stereotypes.

> I get excited reading our literature book, excited over the larger theme I see coming out of that book: the tendency of people to create enemies, to typecast people, basically the roots of racism. This theme has run through the entire year, although I have not always seen it in the literature we've read. But it was there, under the surface, sometimes picked up in our reading discussions, sometimes in a question asked on the response sheets, sometimes in discussions about our social studies. It is something I could have made much more apparent, yet am only now coming to realize was there the whole time. I've looked more at the outer manifestations, the explorations and why themes, and even those were not often brought enough to the surface. (Teacher Journal, 3/28/92)

Themes allowed these "big ideas" to surface, a metaconceptual bonus allowing the students to see beyond the content materials into connections to life experiences. Students could then go beyond the materials to the knowledge itself, exploring, judging, and balancing their developing knowledge. Exploring stereotypes, revealing itself as a year theme in the materials and discussions of our studies, was as much an exploration of humankind as it was an exploration of one's own self. We began our year discussing dealing with differences between people of very different socioeconomic backgrounds in Bridge to Terabithia (Paterson, 1977). Our initial Native American studies focused on the clash of cultures between Native Americans and Europeans. Reading Caddie Woodlawn (Brink, 1935) allowed us to explore in depth the stereotyping of Native Americans during Westward Expansion: racism and fears of people different from you; creating an enemy (Sadaam Hussein); as well as why one would use the label "Tomboy".

> The most interesting part of the discussion for me was discussing the view pioneers had of Indians then. I asked for their opinions, challenging them to think of why pioneers made Indians into such bad guys. The kids came up with the clash over land, the differences in cultures, the fears of the pioneers. I introduced the idea of creating an enemy, and related it to how Sadaam Hussein was portrayed in the Iraqi war. . . Racism and fears of people different from you needs to be a theme of the book which I give much time to. (Teacher Journal, 2/29/92)

These were "big ideas" exactly because they touched our own experiences. By continually relating back to the experiences of the children, the literature became a focal point for discussion to understand the interaction of our studies with students' lives. These were powerful ideas thus tied to student experience.

> In a way, the choices of literature and content create the themes more than even the conscious choices I make as a teacher. Thus the deadliness of textbooks, where the themes are purposefully amorphous and whitewashed, purposefully disconnected. The power to create my own curriculum, although somewhat circumscribed by the state and national curriculum, has allowed me to see into the materials we use, to get excited about what I deem important in the reading and in the studies we do. (Teacher Journal, 3/28/92).

I was struggling with my meaning of a theme study classroom. Truly seizing the power to create curriculum with the children meant both allowing the children to experience the materials of instruction in their own ways, and forcing my "teacher" self to seize the opportunity to go where the children lead me. When I could do that, it allowed us to reveal the deep issues which the literature revealed in ourselves. School knowledge appeared tied to student knowledge through a process of negotiation, but there was still not enough student generation of knowledge involved.

As we launched into our last theme, *Greed and Charity*, I perceived the whole class excited and consumed by the ideas in our study. Studying the civil war fit clearly within the developing year theme of "Exploring Stereotypes"; however, I wanted the theme to be broader. I wanted it to fit into our science, literature, language arts, and mathematics studies as well. I came up with the idea of using the broader question, "Why do people act as they do?" It was only during our studies that I began to see this study as revolving around a duality in human nature. It was not only why people acted as they did, but how humans struggled

with the conflicting forces of greed and charity in themselves and those around them. This understanding began to take shape as we went to the public library history room,

> . . . where we gathered around a table to peruse a copy of the Weekly Courier from 1860. We found some slave ads, "Negroes for sale." ...I read several articles to the group, one about not talking about the abolition movement in front of slaves, one about the slave trade, one about Lincoln, and one about rewards for turning in deserters. Most of the kids were spellbound by the paper and the questions it raised, how totally different it was from today, how the perspectives on life were different... The kids asked about the conditions of selling slaves, prices, splitting families, raising slaves to sell them, and why different slaves could cost different amounts, especially women. (Teacher Journal, 5/3/92).

This was a profound experience for all of us involved in it. A number of parents spoke to me of the impact it had on their children. I was deeply impressed at the intensity with which the children approached the document. The sharing of purpose and focus associated with intersubjectivity was reached, where there existed a joint process of cognitive, social, and emotional interchange (Rogoff, 1990). All of us around the table questioned and answered, explored and wondered. The old newspaper made concrete the world of long ago in a way that allowed us to see it in a new light. It also opened more questions than I as the teacher could answer. We all became inquirers, stretching our minds to understand.

Our reading book, The Slave Dancer (Fox, 1973), added a human face to our ongoing experiences with slavery. It raised the important issue of how people stereotype a group of people in order to see them as less than human. We began to see in the book's characters the struggle between greed and charity. The characters were locked in internal conflict, pitted between their greed, in taking a job on a slaver, and their sense of charity, in viewing the horrible suffering of the slaves and each other as well. This became a focus of our discussions, as we tried to understand how people could act toward others as the slavers acted toward the slaves. At the same time, we dealt with the conflict between slaver and slave,' trying to understand how the slaves could survive such terror. Mark keeps asking how an African could just curl up and die, how they could kill themselves just because they wanted to die (Teacher Journal, 5/16/92). These were deep human experiences we were involved in describing, and the students responded with empathy and interest in trying to understand.

The riots in Los Angeles over the Rodney King beatings occurred around this same time, and became an important topic of discussion in our class. Our study of slavery was propitiously timed as politics and students' experiences and concerns at home paralleled our historical study in class. Moving back and forth from our school study to the events in the world around them allowed me to tie in our historical study. More importantly, it created a real link between our burgeoning historical knowledge and the events unfolding today. Thus the lines between school knowledge and personal knowledge seemed to fall away (McNeil, 1986). School knowledge became important to the students for understanding their world, a part of the cultural content they were experiencing outside school walls. We were not creating answers so much as understanding what the problems were.

> Teacher: ...There is still some coming together, and there is more freedom, but there is still separateness too. What about in terms of money, do you think there is anything left over from slavery days?
> Linda: Black people are a lot poorer...
> Ted: ... more on welfare...
> Mark: ... below the poverty line.
> Teacher: So there is still a lot of poverty that black people have not got out of, while lots of white people have gotten out of it.
> Bob: There are no white people living in the projects...
> Mark: The government seems like it, the Rodney King thing, it doesn't seem right, we should be able to trust our justice system and our courts.
> Nate: Actually the blacks don't have much money. It was the same in the slave years. They didn't have much money then and most of them don't have much money now.
> Teacher: So... never quite gotten out of it.
> Mark: Some people just hate each other. (Videotape transcription, 5/14/92).

This excitement in the quest for knowledge is such an important part of both teaching and learning. Knowledge needs to be alive to be negotiated. It is when the teacher and the student both hold identifiable stakes in the knowledge that real conversation and negotiation can occur. We had become stakeholders in this knowledge negotiation and creation, committed to understanding the relationship between our school studies and the world around us. That link to the outside world was quite clear, and made our studies all the more vital. Knowledge became alive as students actively created questions from their interests, enthusiastically launched into researching slavery, and committed themselves to a questioning

approach. Source documents and events in the world around us propelled the class toward intersubjectivity as we became inquirers in truly "big" questions.

Changing Conceptions of Knowledge

My study focused on how knowledge was approached in my classroom. I began from discontent with the knowledge transmission analogy for education, aspiring toward a knowledge construction analogy. My readings and experiences had convinced me that knowledge was constructed through reciprocal negotiation between the learner and the environment (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). As I grew in understanding my own relationship to knowledge and the student as knower (Lyons, 1990), I gained an appreciation for the importance of moving students toward a more inquisitory and active stance toward knowledge. Initially, I was interested in creating more of a balance between school knowledge and student knowledge. Through my study, I struggled with accepting that knowledge was not a thing to be balanced, but a process to be negotiated. The dialogical nature of knowledge construction became apparent as I influenced student approaches to knowledge construction and was influenced by how students approached knowledge.

In developing stronger explicit beliefs about knowledge as a process of negotiation, I was able to acknowledge the contradictions existent in my practice and more explicitly struggle with the opposing tendencies within myself (Lampert, 1985). I attempted to give students voice as knowers, affirming their knowledge as the basis for knowledge construction within the classroom. I continued to grapple with sharing my role as teacher/expert, sometimes allowing students the freedom to assume instructional authority, at other times reverting to a knowledge transmitter role. Societal and institutional definitions of subject matter continued to exert a strong influence on my stance toward knowledge (Popkewitz, 1988).

Students' Relationship With Knowledge

Interacting with my conceptions of knowledge were the roles I negotiated with students in the process of making them stakeholders in the instructional conversation. My explicit goal was to move away from a view of students acquiring knowledge as "theoretical spectators" (Dewey, 1916, p. 140), where students ingest knowledge whole through the work of their intellect. There needed to be an active phase, where students were connecting to the

knowledge in an active and questioning manner. I add "questioning" here purposefully. Merely being active with knowledge is not enough to ensure students are either experiencing or thinking about the knowledge with which they are interacting.

Dewey (1916) explored the nature of experience and its relationship to thinking. He defined two interacting components that together comprise experience. Experience involves an "active, trying" side, where we act upon or do something in the environment. However, to involve oneself in an experience also involves a "passive, undergoing" side, where we reflect on and question the impact of our activity. Experience becomes cognitive when it involves the attempt to "discover the specific connections between something which we do and the consequences which result, so that the two become continuous" (p.145). The object of constructing knowledge, therefore, is to reach a conclusion which connects our activity and the results of our activity. For Dewey, this conclusion is reached through a process of inquiry. "Since the situation in which thinking occurs is a doubtful one, thinking is a process of inquiry, of looking into things, of investigating" (p. 148).

In my experiences in the classroom, I began to see a differentiation in our relationships with knowledge. Much of what we did in the classroom involved the students actively in their learning. It was in certain aspects of our theme studies where students took a further step toward questioning knowledge, taking a more active role in its construction. Giving the students agency became an important part of this process. Agency involves recognizing oneself as the source of causal power, able to act purposefully toward a goal (Okshevsky, 1992). I intentionally attempted to give both implicit and explicit messages which would allow the students to develop a sense of agency in our approach to knowledge. Sometimes I was successful, but at other times the traditional didactic view prevailed over the best of my intentions. Differing relationships to knowledge resulted from these various aspects of our classroom life.

Three perspectives on knowledge became apparent in the roles students took (see Table 2). Students had a **stable/passive** relationship with knowledge when they viewed themselves as spectators of knowledge, actively interpreting knowledge through their prior experiences but

Table 2. Students' Relationship with Knowledge

---

1. Stable/Passive: Apprentices

--Knowledge seen as something to be understood and accepted, not questioned and reinterpreted.
--Students as spectators of knowledge, actively interpreting knowledge through their prior experiences, but not as decision-makers.
--Literature effective at connecting knowledge to student interest, developing understanding as a part of themselves.

2. Inquisitory/Active: Experts/ Questioners

--Students able to question knowledge, making decisions about validity and importance.
--Process of becoming experts, where knowledge becomes students', translated into their own structures.
--Teacher roles & expectations make possible through modeling critical attitude toward knowledge and its sources.

3. Communal: Community of Learners

--Learning redefined as having purpose beyond the self.
--Classroom ethic developed requiring sharing of expertise with community.
--Students as teachers, questioners, experts; teacher as protagonist.
--Joint problem solving in atmosphere of instructional conversation: all involved in defining knowledge for themselves and for the group.

---

not as decision-makers about that knowledge. I deem this passive, although it matches Dewey's (1916) "active, trying" side, acting upon the knowledge. It is passive, however, in the sense that students accepted the knowledge without developing a sense of agency toward the knowledge. At its extreme, this relationship existed when the classroom reverted to a traditional model of education, concerned primarily with the accumulation of information (Goodlad, 1984). Sometimes in presenting math skills, language rules or geography facts, I would present information purely to be acquired whole without relation to student experience or interest. More often, students viewed knowledge passively in their role as cognitive apprentices (Collins, Brown, & Newman, 1989). "Sitting at the master's feet", students were active in their engagement with the knowledge shared, yet passive in their relationship with that knowledge. Knowledge was something to be understood and accepted, learned from an

expert and then incorporated internally in a decontextualized form. Observation plays a key role in apprenticeship. Students often saw me as the teacher/expert, the one who made decisions and provided them with knowledge. I too easily acquiesced to this defined role, deciding for them when they hesitated to decide for themselves.

There seemed to be a relationship between the nature of knowledge and the approaches one could take to share that knowledge. Some approaches to knowledge in the classroom promoted an extremely passive relationship, where students were almost spectators of knowledge. Facts, skills, and information that were decontextualized fostered a passive relationship, as students were fed information without reflecting on its purpose. Other approaches to knowledge involved students in actively interpreting the knowledge through their prior experiences, making their developing understanding a part of themselves.

The power of story worked within this stable/passive relationship to knowledge. The whole child was immersed in literature, as they experienced the tribulations of the characters in the book, related it to their own experiences, and created new meanings from it. Through the stories we were reading, and the stories we were telling from our own lives in relating to the stories we read, the facts of science and social studies assumed meaning. Students seemed able to construct deeper understandings of other cultures, historical periods, and human themes through their active negotiation with the teacher and the text. But the books and the ideas were mostly of the teacher's choice. As others have also found, students are not critical of literary or historical sources except through the suggestion of the teacher (Levstik, 1986).

An **inquisitory/active** relationship with knowledge was approached when students were able to question knowledge, making decisions about validity and importance. To a degree, this is the "passive, undergoing" side to which Dewey (1916) referred, where, through reflection on activity, the student attempts to create meaning from experience. More than the passive side, questioning and justifying knowledge within a community of learners involves the process of discovering the connections between the two sides of experience, enabling the student to be an active participant in her/his learning (Nowell, 1992). Questioning knowledge, inquiring into the meanings behind the facts, was part of the enterprise that I began to see as primary in my classroom. "I must see thematic pale in comparison to inquiry as the focus for

the relationship to knowledge" (Teacher Journal, 1/18/92). Inquiring into "big" ideas, investigating problems that allowed for alternative interpretations, set a tone for this relationship to knowledge. When, as a group, we began to discuss inherently problematic areas with no one right answer, with multiple interpretations, then questioning knowledge became acceptable in open discussion. The knowledge became personal through identification with students' prior knowledge, but knowledge became intellectual through the decision-making in which students were involved.

This personal connection to knowledge, this process of becoming knowledgable, can become the opening for inquiry. Allowing students to assume the roles of teachers and learners allowed students to perceive themselves and others as resources. They could learn from all, not just the teacher. Key to developing toward a community of inquiry was students' relationship to expertise in the classroom. Expertise was valued; but at the same time, expertise began to be something to be questioned. Expertise did not necessarily mean you knew the truths. Instead, it gradually began to involve sharing your developing knowledge in a questioning atmosphere. This is a key differentiation from a psychological definition of expertise. Psychology tends to ignore the acquisition of values toward knowledge that always accompanies the acquisition of knowledge and skills (Goodnow, 1990). My goal in the classroom was understanding, not through attaining truths but through participation in active questioning of expertise.

I saw the roles and expectations of the teacher as essential in this process. I attempted to move more toward becoming the leader and organizer of questioning, modeling for the students a critical attitude toward knowledge and its sources. The students, while being accountable for the knowledge shared, also were encouraged to become critical questioners themselves, to move the discussions in the directions of their own interests. During our planet presentations, students began to ask questions that tied our developing knowledge to their concerns for their own world. Debates and simulations encouraged students to question easily agreed-upon solutions to complex questions. Literature study became an opportunity for students to begin challenging meanings. We were beginning to move away from the view that knowledge was not to be questioned, toward seeing knowledge as open to all to interpret and

critique. In our explorer debates, questioning standard interpretations began to be encouraged. It continued intermittently in our free-wheeling discussions which accompanied the various student presentations throughout the year. "This was my aim, to create that sense of authorship of knowledge, where each had their role to contribute to the knowledge base of the whole" (Teacher Journal, 4/12/92). Toward the end of the year, as we were trying to understand the source documents about slavery along with the racial riots occurring in the students' present world, we struggled as a group to construct our understandings. Negotiating meanings began to become important for the group. My stance was not one of expert, but of "Let's figure this out together." The students brought to the conversation a desire to understand, a purpose in gaining knowledge. We shared this purpose, both in terms of understanding but also in terms of the types of questioning we saw necessary. There were no easy answers to the historical and socio-economic struggles we discussed. Yet both the students and I held identifiable stakes in the knowledge we negotiated. Our conversations aimed at mediating our personal knowledge with societal and school knowledge, negotiating meaning out of an unsettling world.

Students gradually began to take a **communal** approach to knowledge, relating to knowledge as part of a community of learners. A community of inquiry was just beginning to develop, where students and teacher could communicate with each other impartially and consistently, willing to "submit their views to the self-correcting process of further inquiry" (Sharp, 1987, p. 42). Learning began to be redefined as having a purpose beyond the self. Small steps were made toward a developing ethic requiring the sharing of expertise with the community, where the group could jointly construct meaning from one's growing knowledge. Within the group, students were sometimes teachers, questioners, experts. The teacher was occasionally protagonist, moving from questioner to teacher to learner, both physically and intellectually. At these times, the group aided each other in the process of transforming information into knowledge, together constructing knowledge in an atmosphere consistent at times with a zone of proximal development.

As the year progressed, the group became more able to carry on instructional conversations, where all were involved in defining knowledge for themselves and for the group

(Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). We were able to move back and forth from our school study to the events in the world around the students. The lines between school knowledge and personal knowledge were becoming less clear as students became stakeholders in knowledge negotiation and creation. Knowledge needs to be alive to be negotiated. Our studies of slavery and racism came closest to approaching this. In the excitement of the quest for understanding the events in the world around us was found the stakes in that knowledge. Our communal conversations around our final studies of greed and charity began to mediate school knowledge with personal knowledge. But it was only our final study which began to break down individualistic approaches. Prior to this, there were only fleeting glimpses of a communal approach to knowledge within our classroom.

Power Relations in the Classroom

There appeared to be some movement by the students in my class from a stable/passive approach to knowledge toward an inquisitory/active and communal relationship with knowledge. What made this movement possible? It was more than just by force of the teacher's desire to change. The social construction of the classroom, of the meaning of schooling, seems to have changed, promoted by changes in the underlying power relations in the classroom.

Schooling is a social construction, constructed symbolically by the mind through social interaction (McLaren, 1989). The meaning of schooling is in part imposed on us through its social construction as an institution (Young, 1971). Schooling represents the institutionalization of habitualized social actions, taken-for-granted routines which take on the appearance of objective reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Routine is teachers' bread and butter, the glue that holds together a diverse group of individuals with differing goals. Through routine, the classroom world is established. The teacher and students together construct a background of routine which serves "to stabilize both their separate actions and their interaction" (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 57). Life in schools becomes habitualized through the reciprocal interaction between students and teacher. Habit and routine become the life-blood of schooling.

In my classroom, I attempted to change this social construction of schooling. My goals

included promoting a questioning relationship to knowledge along with a democratic approach to classroom relations. I negotiated with the students to find a middle ground between their expectations of schooling and my goals. At the same time that routines were established and habitualized, I attempted to push both the students and myself to make questioning and inquiry a part of our routines. I did not feel prepared to go beyond certain routinized aspects of school, nor to deal with the classroom control issues raised by students transgressing the socially constructed boundaries of classroom behavior. My classroom was historically situated both within the larger world of schooling and within the smaller history of my particular school. My school prided itself on being child-centered, providing an opening for viewing schooling within a somewhat different analogy. At the same time, our culturally mediated definition of schooling continued to limit what both the students and I viewed as possible in the classroom. It was within these socially constructed boundaries that I moved to promote an inquiry approach to knowledge. Within the routines, socially constructed both from without and within, I attempted to encourage a process which could allow the actors in the classroom to take a personal active stance toward knowledge.

My classroom was defined in this dialectical process of interaction between us as individuals, our classroom world, and the larger society. As social actors within our particular situation, we both created our situation and were created by the larger social universe (McLaren, 1989). I wanted to see knowledge as a process of negotiation between the students and myself. I wanted to view learning as active construction within a social context. Yet I still saw many instances in my teaching where I controlled the world view and acted to minimize any student resistance to my view. I cannot separate my role in the classroom from the role of power relations in the classroom. Knowledge in the modern world has become a technology of power (Popkewitz, 1988). The social construction of my classroom and of knowledge negotiation within it was deeply rooted in "a nexus of power relations" (McLaren, 1989, p. 169).

The changes I perceived in students' relationships to knowledge were, to a large degree, possible only within changed power relationships in the classroom. Power relations can be seen within the discourses in a classroom. Michel Foucault refers to a discourse as a

family of concepts, governed by rules that determine what can be said or unsaid, who can speak with authority and who has to listen (McLaren, 1989). Bernstein (1971) has delineated two types of discourses which are embedded in pedagogic discourse. Instructional discourse transmits intellectual and other skills and their relations, while regulative discourse transmits the concepts of conduct, character, and manner which form the moral basis of the social order of the classroom and school. Power relations can be analyzed in terms of both structure and interaction (Morais & Neves, 1991). Structure refers to the nature of power relations between categories of discourse, such as the boundaries between teacher and student or between disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge. Interaction relates to the communication between the actors involved, especially in terms of who controls legitimate communication between various participants in the classroom. Power relations are manifest both in the structure that exists and in the interactions occurring in the classroom.

The structure of power relations in my classroom appeared to be marked by relatively sharp boundaries between teacher and students. Although more open than the very sharp boundaries typical of traditional classrooms (Morais & Neves, 1991), the teacher still generally determined the legitimate relations between subjects, spaces, and discourses and the practices in both the instructional and regulative contexts of the classroom. There was no question that I was the teacher, in charge, and responsible for the direction of the classroom. At the same time, there existed some room for movement within the relationship. I was often open to student suggestion, available to their ideas, and committed to involving them in decision-making. Class meetings, group discussions and conversations, student participation in curricular decision-making, all led to students viewing themselves as involved in deciding issues of importance in the classroom. While my stance weakened boundaries, cultural and historical influences continued to strengthen those same boundaries. Classroom life was defined by pressure from the administration, other teachers, and parents, control issues related to classroom behavior, and our collective apprenticeship of observation, creating expectations of what we could and could not do. In socially constructing these boundaries, the play of context, perceived constraints, and history went far in limiting openness.

The dialectic between control and freedom was at issue from the beginning of the year.

I was continually struggling with the balance between open-ended assignments and perceived off-task behavior. My role as facilitator opened the stage for negotiation with students, yet was counterbalanced by my role as classroom manager. During student presentations, I juggled conflicting demands to invite students into the process of knowledge construction while maintaining order in the classroom. I tended to fall back on routine to create a structure within which classroom life could be defined. The structure of routine set a tone for habitualized actions where students had voice, but within tacit boundaries established by the teacher. Some students, seeing an opening in power relations within the classroom, attempted to wield their power in more explicit ways. I often responded by re-exerting control in a more obvious manner, yet struggled with balancing this role with my curricular goals.

On the interactional level, regulative discourses in my classroom involved interpersonal control modalities: the specific attributes of students were recognized in establishing the norms of social conduct (Morais & Neves, 1991). Control mechanisms in the classroom were instituted which involved the community in regulating the behavior of its members. Classroom meetings and group behavior reward systems shared some of this power with students, but implicit in the classroom was the ultimate power of the teacher. Likewise, the personal reasons of students' conduct was acknowledged and given credence within the established norms of social conduct. When students went beyond the limits of social norms, I struggled with conflicting impulses to use personal appeals, based on community expectations, or imperative demands, based solely on my authority. As students felt empowered to promote their own agendas, my dilemma deepened. Creating an open democratic classroom was a stated aim of mine, yet some student behavior continued to challenge the limits of my authority. Decreasing my explicit authority in the classroom, although personally and institutionally audacious, appeared to provide the opening necessary for students to move toward more active stances toward knowledge.

The instructional discourse varied considerably in my classroom. Sometimes instruction was centered exclusively on the teacher, with the teacher determining the form of learning without allowing any student intervention. At other times, students were invited into the process, although the process was still centered on the teacher. In our theme study

discussions and presentations, instruction was centered primarily on the students, with the students having a strong voice in the selection and presentation of the content. The teacher continued to provide overall direction in the selection, sequence, pacing, and evaluation of instruction, but students were given the power to determine aspects of daily instruction. Discussions and presentations embraced student voice in the instructional discourse. Acknowledging student voice affirms that students are knowing subjects, already possessing valid viewpoints (O'Loughlin, 1990). At times, our discussions and presentations moved toward conversation and dialogue, and I became just another discussant in the community. More often, however, my power lay implicit below the surface of the discussion. Students' participation was restricted to what fit in my pre-established global plan for instruction. I determined the limits of the instructional discourse.

This weakening of teacher control of both the instructional and regulative discourses allowed students more control over communication within the pedagogic context. We return to the idea that, within the power relations existent in the classroom, students began to develop a sense of agency in their approach to knowledge. Weakening the boundaries between teacher and student in determining the legitimacy of both the instructional and regulative discourses enabled students to begin a process toward becoming "masters of their thinking" (Freire, 1972, p. 66). At the same time, power continued to circulate in traditional ways within the institution we inhabited. Within this dialectic, movement toward different relationships with knowledge were made, yet much stayed the same.

Conclusions

The social construction of the classroom environment underlies the development of conceptions of knowledge. It appeared to be the social context of the classroom which could allow movement toward more inquisitory and active stances on knowledge. The changes I sought involved moving past the creation of curricula to the creation of a social context where theme provided a focus for a change in the forms of discourse within the classroom. Delineating "big" questions began the process of redefining the discourse, viewing subject matter as a source for inquiry. As questioning became important in the process of theme study, powerful crosscutting ideas within the content could become apparent. Students and

teacher could then both hold stakes in the conversation and negotiation of knowledge. Although it was difficult to maintain this inquiry orientation, its power to connect to student experience and the world around us became obvious.

Changing the forms of discourse appeared to be possible only within the boundaries of power relations between teacher and students. When those boundaries allowed some movement, then students could be empowered to express their voice. At times, the instructional discourse within the classroom allowed students the space to move toward more inquisitory and active stances toward knowledge. The classroom was defined in a dialectical process between control and freedom. When teacher control weakened, discussions and presentations moved toward conversation and dialogue. As traditional control mechanisms were reestablished, teaching reverted to one-way communication. Progress toward different conceptions of knowledge were made within this dialectical process of power relations in the classroom. It was through the empowering of student voice, and the disempowering of teacher control, that progress toward an inquisitory and active approach to knowledge seemed possible. The negotiation of knowledge by teacher and students in the classroom was determined by the power relations between individuals in the classroom, the school, and our larger society. This points toward the importance of developing an awareness of power relationships and their effects on conceptions of knowledge. Lessening the authority of the teacher appears crucial for this movement in student conceptions of knowledge to occur.

The social construction of the classroom appeared to be the decisive variable in promoting inquisitory and active approaches to knowledge in my classroom. The interaction which occurred between and among students and teacher created a classroom environment which could allow or restrict student voice. The social construction of the classroom is deeply rooted in power relations (McLaren, 1989). Some see whole language as a social process which attempts to shift control of literacy from teacher to students (Willinsky, 1990). I have likewise postulated in this study that inquisitory and active approaches to knowledge were possible only within the shifting boundaries of power relations between teacher and students. Empowering student voice and limiting teacher control appear to underlie movement in student conceptions of knowledge. Educational research has just begun to scratch the surface of

understanding this interaction between power, control, and learning. There is not enough research into the factors involved in weakening the boundaries of power relations in classrooms (Morais & Neves, 1991). What makes visible or invisible classroom pedagogy and the play of power relations? How do the different discourses within the social construction of the classroom interact to weaken or strengthen boundaries? How much movement is possible within the boundaries of power relations in schools as they are currently constituted? How do we promote movement within the reality of institutional and societal constraints? Research inside classrooms needs to continue to pursue these important questions.

References

Beck, E.M. (1977). Sailor Historian: The Best of Samuel Eliot Morison. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge. New York: Doubleday.

Bernstein, B. (1971). On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In M. Young (Ed.), Knowledge and control: New directions for the sociology of education. London: Collier Macmillan.

Brink, C.R. (1935). Caddie Woodlawn. New York: Scholastic.

Brown, A.L., & Campione, J. (1990). Communities of learning and thinking, or a context by any other name. Contributions to Human Development, 21, 108-126.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1993). Inside/Outside: Teacher research and knowledge. New York: Teachers College Press.

Collins, A., Brown, J., & Newman, S. (1989). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the craft of reading, writing, and mathematics. In L. Resnick (Ed.), Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Corbett, D. & Wilson, B. (1995). Make a difference with, not for, students: A plea to researchers and reformers. Educational Researcher, 24(5), 12-17.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education. New York: The Free Press.

Dewey, J. (1931/1964). The way out of educational confusion. In R. Archambault (Ed.), John Dewey on education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1931)

Eisner, E.W. (1991). The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice. New York: Macmillan.

Fox, P. (1973). The slave dancer. New York: Dell.

Freire, P. (1972/1989). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Continuum (Originally published by Penguin Books, 1972).

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw Hill.

Goodman, K. (1986). What's whole in whole language? Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Goodnow, J. (1990). Using sociology to extend psychological accounts of cognitive development. Human Development, 33, 81-107.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). Ethnography: Principles in practice. New York: Tavistock.

Jacobs, H.H. (Ed.) (1989). Interdisciplinary curriculum: Design and implementation. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (1982). The action research planner. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Lampert, M. (1985). How do teachers manage to teach? Perspectives on problems in practice. Harvard Educational Review, 55, 178-194.

Levstik L. (1986). The relationship between historical response and narrative in a sixth grade classroom. Theory and Research in Social Education, 14, 1-19.

Lyons, N. (1990). Dilemmas of knowing: Ethical and epistemological dimensions of teachers' work and development. Harvard Educational Review, 60, 159-180.

McCutcheon, G., & Jung, B. (1990). Alternative perspectives on action research. Theory into Practice, 29, 144-151.

McLaren, P. (1989). Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education. New York: Longman.

McNeil, L. (1986). Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Morais, A., & Neves, I. (1991). Towards a sociological theory of instruction: Pedagogic practices and power and control relations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Nowell, L. (1992). Rethinking the classroom: A community of inquiry. Paper presented at the National Conference on Creating the Quality School, Norman, OK.

Okshevsky, W.C. (1992). Epistemological and hermeneutic conceptions of the nature of understanding: The cases of Paul H. Hirst and Martin Heidegger. Educational Theory, 42, 5-23.

O'Loughlin, M. (1990). Teachers' ways of knowing: A journal study of teacher learning in a dialogical and constructivist learning environment. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Paterson, K. (1977). Bridge to Terabithia. New York: Harper Collins.

Polakow, V. (1985). Whose stories should we tell? A call to action. Language Arts, 62, 826-835.

Popkewitz, T. (1988). Knowledge, power, and a general curriculum. In I. Westbury and A. Purves (Eds.), Cultural literacy and the idea of general education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rogoff, B. (1990). Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sharp, A.M. (1987). What is a 'community of inquiry'? Journal of Moral Education, 16, 37-45.

Tharp, R.G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context. New York: Cambridge University Press.

van Manen, M. (1990). Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy. New York: State University of New York Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Willinsky, J. (1990). The new literacy: Redefining reading and writing in the schools. New York: Routledge.

Young, M. (1971). Introduction: Knowledge and control. In M. Young (Ed.), Knowledge and control: New directions for the sociology of education. London: Collier Macmillan.

C:\WPWIN60\PUBLCNS\POWER.PAP